

REMARKS

In response to the Official Action mailed June 29, 2006, Applicant submits the following amendments and remarks. Claims 1, 5, 8, and 11 have been amended. However, no new matter has been added to the claims as a result of these amendments.

CLAIM REJECTION 35 U.S.C. §103 - MCCLARD IN VIEW OF OZER

Claims 1, 2, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,438,752 to *McClard* (hereinafter "*McClard*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,929 to *Ozer et al.* (hereinafter "*Ozer*").

*McClard* describes a system wherein a television viewer's channel selection is recorded if the channel is not changed for a predetermined amount of time. See *McClard* Col. 5, ll. 43-65. Upon the viewer's depression of a "favorite channel" key, the system tunes the television to the channel most often viewed by that viewer during the current period of the day. *Id.*, at Col. 6, ll. 32-40.

*Ozer* describes a system which tracks a viewer's behavior information by recording "events," such as channel changes. The viewer behavior information may be transmitted over an Internet line. Col. 10, ll. 7-20.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a storage unit in which the reception log and [a] receiver ID is recorded," and "an interface for transmitting the receiver ID and the reception log." (emphasis supplied) These limitations are neither described nor suggested by *McClard* or *Ozer*, either alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over these references.

Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1 and therefore include all the limitations thereof. As such, Applicant submits that claims 2 and 4 are patentable over McClard and Ozer for at least the same reasons as discussed in connection with claim 1.

**CLAIM REJECTION 35 U.S.C. §103 - MCCLARD IN VIEW OF SEZAN**

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,438,752 to *McClard* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0091685 to *Sezan et al.* (hereinafter "*Sezan*").

Claim 5 has been amended to recite a receiving unit, including a receiver ID, a controller, and a mounting unit "wherein by mounting the storage unit on the mounting section *the receiver ID and the reception log detected by the controller are recorded in the storage unit,*" and "by mounting the storage unit on an external computer the computer reads *the receiver ID and the reception log from the storage unit.*" (emphasis supplied) Neither McClard nor Sezan teach or suggest the use of a receiver ID. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 5 is patentable over McClard and Sezan based, at least, on the receiver ID recitations and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn. Further, since claim 7 depends from claim 5 and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 5, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as discussed in connection with claim 5.

**CLAIM REJECTION 35 U.S.C. §103(a) - IVANYI IN VIEW OF MCCLARD**

Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,286,140 to *Ivanyi* (hereinafter "*Ivanyi*") in view of McClard. *Ivanyi* discloses a

system for storing and processing data relating to a television viewer's preferences.

Claim 8 has been amended to recite a viewing and listening information computing method, comprising the steps of "obtaining a reception log *and a receiver ID* of at least one broadcast receiver and recording the reception log *and the receiver ID* in a database" and "reading the reception log, *the receiver ID*, and the program information from the database and computing viewing and listening information." (emphasis supplied) As discussed in the Specification, this enables accurate detection of preferences of individual viewers among a large audience. See e.g. *Specification* p. 20, ¶ 1.

Ivanyi fails to teach or describe the newly added limitations of claim 8. Furthermore, McClard does not cure the deficiencies of Ivanyi. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 8, and claims 9-13 which depend therefrom, are patentable over Ivanyi and McClard based, at least, on the added limitations.

#### CONCLUSION

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone Applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: September 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Bruno Polito

Registration No.: 38,580  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

692158\_1.DOC